



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## NOTES AND DISCUSSION.

**The Book of Jubilees, translated from a text based on two hitherto uncollated Ethiopic MSS.**

## INTRODUCTION.

THE text from which I propose to make the translation that will appear in subsequent numbers of THE QUARTERLY is based on two most valuable Ethiopic MSS. belonging respectively to the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. These MSS. possess the merit not only of being amongst the oldest existing Ethiopic MSS., but also of presenting a type of text which transcends immeasurably that of the two MSS. on which Dr. Dillmann's Ethiopic edition of 1859 is based. It will be remembered that one of Dillmann's MSS. is a most faulty transcription of a MS. of this book made during the present century by the Abyssinian secretary of Dr. Krappf, and presented by the latter to the Tübingen Library in 1844. As, however, this was the only MS. attainable at the time, Dr. Dillmann corrected its errors as far as possible, and translated it into German, accompanied with a short commentary in Ewald's *Jahrbücher der biblischen Wissenschaft*, Bd. II., 1850, s. 230-256, and Bd. III., 1851, s. 1-96.

A few years later, Dillmann obtained from M. Abbadie another Ethiopic MS. (eighteenth century) of this book. Though it was undoubtedly of considerable value in the formation of a text, it deserves in full the severe judgment of the editor—*apographum ingenti et vitiorum et mendorum numero laborantem et Tubingensi viæ melius censendum*. With the help of these two MSS., Dillmann published, as we have already remarked, his Ethiopic text in 1859.

Happily it is not to the Ethiopic version only that we are indebted for our present knowledge of the Book of Jubilees. More than a fourth of this work was discovered by Ceriani in an old Latin version in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, and published by this scholar in his *Monumenta sacra et profana ex Codd. præsertim bibliothecæ Ambrosianæ*, Mediol., 1861, Tom. I., Fasc. I., pp. 15-62. This Latin fragment was subsequently edited by Rönisch in 1874, accompanied by a commentary and learned excursions, and the value of this book was materially enhanced by Dr. Dillmann's contribution

—a Latin translation of the portion of the Ethiopic text corresponding to the Latin fragment.

It is worthy of note in the present connection that this Latin translation of Dr. Dillmann *is not made* from the published Ethiopic text of 1859, but in reality from a revised form of this text, the revision being in the main carried out on the lines suggested by the Latin fragment. This continued advance to a more scientific text is quite in keeping with the method of this great scholar in other departments of work. With a mind biassed only in favour of truth and open to all fresh evidence from whatever quarter derived, he furnishes us with the beau ideal of a scientific scholar. It is therefore incumbent on those who follow in his footsteps to carry on still further the work that he has advanced so far. Accordingly, in the following criticism of Dillmann's text, it is to his latest work on this subject, his Latin translation, or, rather, to the revised Ethiopic text which this Latin translation presupposes, that we shall confine our investigation, and contrast its achievement with the highest that is now made possible through the discovery and use of fresh manuscript evidence. We may despatch in a word the result of this investigation, and state its conclusion briefly, *i.e.*, that the text which is based on Dillmann's two manuscripts, however much it may be revised or emended with the help of the Latin fragment, can, in the presence of the better evidence now accessible, only be regarded as at the best late and corrupt. In the comparison of the Ethiopic MSS., which we shall presently institute, the Latin fragment will serve as a touchstone whereby to distinguish the false from the true in the variants presented by the two types of MSS. with which we have now to deal.

The text from which my translation is made I hope to publish in the course of the year. This text is founded in the main on the two ancient fifteenth and sixteenth century MSS., which I have above mentioned. These two MSS. will be designated respectively as A and B in the following investigation, while the MSS. used by Dillmann and designated by him as T and A, will be cited here as C and D respectively.

To meet our present purpose there is no need of exhaustive treatment. It will be sufficient to show.—(i.) That *every page we examine of the revised Ethiopic text presupposed by Dillmann's Latin translation contains many corrupt readings where the demonstrably true reading is preserved by AB, or A, or B in agreement with the Latin version.* ii. That in not a few cases Dillmann's text is disfigured by corruptions that admit of easy and at times demonstrably certain emendation.

II. I will deal with the latter and less important class first, and at

the outset invite attention to two instructive instances where, after having restored the text solely by means of the materials at Dillmann's disposal, I afterwards found my emendations confirmed by MS. evidence. In xxix. 15, we read 'eska : 'ama : 'Aqrábî and corresponding to it in the Latin version *usque aggruum Acrabin*. Both versions are corrupt, but the former points to the true text. Here Dillmann through an oversight takes 'eska : 'ama=*usque* of place, but this is impossible, as this phrase can only be used temporally ; but as no temporal signification was applicable here, I saw clearly that 'ama must be corrupt, and that the corruption arose simply through a wrong vocalisation of 'ôma=*arbor*, and that thus the *vox nulla* in the Latin version *aggruum* is a corruption of *arborem*. The *gg* in *aggruum* are almost indecipherable. Some weeks later I found that 'ôma was actually the reading of A. Thus the rendering should be "to the tree (or oak) of Aqrâbit." This is all the more interesting as it points to an original variation in the text of Num. xxxiv. 4, and Josh. xv. 3, and supposes לעלת עקרבים instead of למעלה עקרבים.

Again in xxxi. 16. Over against *astarêjô=manifestationem* the Latin version gives *semitas meas*. Here I at once changed 'astarêjô into *asarâtja=semitas meas*, and I found later that both A and B gave the sing. collective form of this word *asarja=semitas meas*. The following emendations of the text are not supported by MS. evidence but are nevertheless necessary. I shall adduce only a few. In xxi. 7 *teblûl=involutum* from *tablala* exactly contravenes the right sense of the context, as is clear from the Latin version *separa* and Lev. iii. 10, יסירנה. For *teblûl* therefore we must read *tebalel=separabis*, from *balala*, which we must no longer regard as an unused root as in Dillmann's Lex. Col. 486.

In xxii. 16, for *reshat : rekûs=inquinamento immundo* read *res'at : warekûs=injustitia et inquinamento*. So Latin version. For *kuelû=universum* read *ellû=isti*. So Latin. Make the same correction in xxiv. 25. In xxix. 14, for *takuânanû=litem composuerunt* read *takuânanô=* Latin version *propitiatus ei*. I may add at the conclusion of this section that where an emended text is followed in my translation, the unamended reading will be given in a foot-note. The manifold other variations from Dillmann's published text rest on MS. evidence, and will be justified later in my published text and commentary.

I. In Dillmann's revised Ethiopic text we must make such corrections as the following.

In xiii. 8, for *tatakula* read *takala* with A, B, and Latin, and for *hóra* read *bîhr* with B and Latin. In xiii. 10, for *za* read *zaz* with

A, B, and Latin, and in xiii. 12 insert negative before *jethuḏlaque* with A, B, and Latin. In xv. 11, for *maskabômû* read with B *meksabômû* = *praeputium eorum*. So Latin. This word, accordingly must be added in Dillmann's Lex. under *kasaba*, and the article on *maskab*, col. 381, struck out. A gives *kesbatû* = *circumcisio ejus*. In xv. 12, omit *kuelû*, with A, B, C, and Latin; in 13, omit *wa* before *ze*, with B and Latin; in 15, for *nasarômû* = *providit eos*, read with A, B, *ansârômû*. So Latin version *coram*, and omit *layedâsê* with A, B, and Latin.

In xvi. 5, after *jezēmenvôî* add with A, B, *basēgâhômû*. So Latin in *carnibus suis*; in 6, omit *kuelû*, with A, B, and Latin; in 7, for *adhanô* read with A, B, *nâdhenô*. So Latin *liberavimus*. In 10, after *Kêbrôn* add with A, B, and Latin, *wahôrû*; in 12, for *jebêlâ* read with A, B, and Latin, *jebê*; in 14, omit *buz warh* with A, B, C, and Latin; in 15, for *zata'azazna* read with B and Latin *zata'azaza*; in 19, omit *'abîja* with A, B, C, and Latin; in 20, omit *'Abreh'âm* with A, B, C, and Latin, and after *Kel'êta* add *wa'abhakua*: *kel'êtu* with A, B, C, and Latin; in 21, omit *la'egzî'abhêr* with A, B (C), and Latin; in 23, for *Kamez* read *zanta* with A, B, C, and Latin; in 25, omit *lafatârîhû* with A, B, C, and Latin; in 28, omit *lazentû* with B and Latin.

In xviii. 9, for *jebêlô* read *'ebêlô* with B and Latin; in 14, for *'ajdâ'ha* read *'ajda'hû* with A, B, and Latin. In xix. 5, omit *leb* with A, B, C, and Latin; in 14, for *hesum* read *fesum* with B and Gen. xxv. 27; in 21, for *tetfâsehû* read *tetfusâh*: *lebakî* with A, B, and Latin; in 23, after *Malal'êl* add *'Ênôs* with A, B, and Latin.

In xx. 8, B, and in part A, rightly supplies the lacuna in the text *wa'ibamentanî*: *kuelômû*: *tawakalû*. So Latin in *nihilo confidunt*. Perhaps *omnes* has fallen out before *confidunt*. In 9, for *wa'antemûsa* read *'allâ* with B and Latin. In xxi. 1, omit *'abûhû* with A, B, C, and Latin; in 4, omit *'amadâ* with A, B, D, and Latin.

In xxii. 5, omit *zajēsēnî* with A, B, D, and Latin; in 8, before *'esma* add *'ana* with B and Latin; in 9, after *hônâ* add *nî* with A, B, and Latin; in 10, omit *'Amlâkîja* with A, B, D, and Latin, and after *šâhlka* add *wasalâmka* with B and Latin; in 11, for *jebêlô* read *jebê* with B and Latin; in 13, after *laka* add *'ahzâb* with A, B, D, and Latin; in 14, omit *medr*: *wahaba*: *zar'a* with A, B, C, and Latin, and for *hezbu* read *hezv* with A, B, and Latin; in 16, omit *'egzî'e* with A,

B, D, and Latin; in 19, for *gemúnân*: *wasagórâr*: *maswâ'etômú* read with (A), B, and Latin *gemn*: *wamenâné*: *wasagórâr*: *maswâ'etômú*.

In xxiii. 6, for *tafasama* read *fasama* with A, B and Latin; in 10 for 'ijôbêljú read 'amatât with A, B and Latin; in 24 for *hatâw'ihômú*: *lahezab*: *la'ella* read *hâte'anihômú*: *la'ahzâb*: 'ella with A, B and Latin.

In xxiv. 14 for *fengâ* read *ferângâ*, i.e., a transliteration of *φαραγγι*, with B: in 18 for *bâhr* read *medr* with A, B and Latin: in 24 for *jahabômú* read *jahabô* with A, B and Latin, and omit *jesârwômú* with A, B, D and Latin.

In xxvi. 9, for *habéhâ* Dillmann has rightly read *zajen'es* with D, but we must further add *waldâ* with A, B and Latin; in 10 omit *naja* and *n'etú* with A, B, D and Latin: in 12 for *jebê* read *jebêlô* with B and Latin.

Let us conclude this section with the chief corrections of xxx. In 5 omit *wa'eska*: *la'alam* with A, B, C and Latin: in 8 after *kuelô* add *marwâ'ela* with A, B, C and Latin: in 13 for 'emna: 'ahzâb: *awâlda* read 'em'anâlda: 'ahzâb with A, B and Latin: in 21 omit *barakata* with A, B and Latin, and *na* before *kuelô* with B and Latin: in 25 place *wakuelô*: *nawâjômú* immediately after 'a'edûgihômú with B and Latin.

Before closing this article it will not be amiss to give some of the characteristics of the Latin version.

Of corruptions we might cite that of *seminis* into *nominis* in xxii. 13, of *alterum* into *tertium* in xxiv. 16, of *itinere* into *inferni* in xxiv. 27, of *namque* into *nequa* in xxxv. 9, of *qui* into *quia* in xxix. 12. Some corruptions are due no doubt to mistranslations of the Hebrew and Greek texts. Thus *agnoscantur* in xix. 24, instead of *renoventur* (Eth.), is due to a confusion of ἀναγνωθῶσι with ἀναγνωσθῶσι.

In xxiii. 7, xxviii. 20, 22, xxix. 18, 21, xxx. 14, etc., etc., there are extensive corruptions which it is not easy to explain. In these cases the Ethiopic preserves the true text. In other instances, the corruption is due to the influence of the LXX. on the Latin version of Jubilees. Thus, in xvii. 5 *visus* is thrust into the text, owing to εἶφάνη in LXX. against Ethiopic version of Jubilees and the Hebrew of Genesis; so also in xxvi. 16 we have *sicut odor agri pleni*, where the last word is due to πλήρως in the LXX., but is omitted in the Ethiopic version of Jubilees and in the Hebrew of Genesis. Again, in xxix. 14, *Et undecim filii ipsius* is a corruption of *die undecimo ejus* due to Gen. xxxii. 23. Finally, the text is often defective, and the omissions are not unfrequently due to homoioteleuton. Thus, in xxiv. 24, *et qui effugerint e gladio adversarii et e Chetem*, in

xxxii. 34, *et quercum quercum luctus Diborae*, and in xxxii. 37, *nomen ejus filium doloris mei, quia doloribus laboravit quum pareret, pater autem ejus vocavit*, are all lost through homoioteleuton.

The Latin, it thus appears, is far from being a faultless version, and yet it is invaluable in the criticism of the text; for its corruptions are, as a rule, easy to trace and seldom coincide with those of the Ethiopic version.

I hope later to deal exhaustively with these questions of textual criticism in the introduction to my edition of the text, but the above will be sufficient to demonstrate the superiority of the fresh manuscript evidence here adduced, and to justify the issue of such an edition.

R. H. CHARLES.

---